© 2026 Arabian International Conference on Science,Technology and Innovation. All rights reserved.

CONCEPTS AND CATEGORIES OF COGNITIVE LINGUISTICS AS A METHODOLOGY FOR COMPARATIVE LINGUISTICS

Nilufar Shavkatovna Buranova
Associate Professor, Department of Language Teaching in Medicine Faculty of Medicine, Andijan Branch of Kokand University
DOI:https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.24041446

In Uzbekistan, a special place is occupied by the comparison of the region's two main languages: Uzbek and Russian. The justification for choosing this specific language pair is not limited to practical motivation; Russian and Uzbek belong to different linguistic types—inflectional-fusional Indo-European and agglutinative Turkic, respectively. If two languages coincided in their methods of text construction, categorical division, and the structure of culturally entrenched concepts, comparative analysis would be devoid of its subject matter.

The cognitive-semantic core relevant to this comparison has been examined in such frameworks as R. Langacker's theory of construal and cognitive grammar, L. Talmy's semantics of closed-class grammatical categories, E. Rosch and G. Lakoff's prototypical categorization theory, and the apparatus of conceptual metaphor and blending (Talmy, 2000).

Uzbek linguistics has approached cognitive issues along two paths. The first path is proper cognitive linguistics: the systematic introduction of the concepts of conceptualization, categorization, and the concept itself into Uzbek academic discourse is associated primarily with the works of Sh. Safarov, whose book "Kognitiv tilshunoslik" became for Uzbek linguistics what foundational compendia are to Western scholarship—a focal point for consolidating disparate ideas into a distinct discipline (Safarov, 2006). The second path is linguocultural, highlighted in the works of N. Mahmudov, D. Khudoyberganova, and a number of their followers, where the analysis of the Uzbek word is reoriented from a system-structural description to an anthropocentric one, viewing meaning as a trace of the community's cultural experience (Mahmudov & Khudoyberganova, 2015). Special mention should be made of Uzbek phraseography and phraseology: Sh. Rahmatullaev's phraseological dictionary and his research on fixed expressions provide empirically reliable access to the figurative foundations of the Uzbek worldview, since it is precisely within phraseology that conceptual metaphors and metonymies are most densely entrenched (Rahmatullaev, 1992).

Significantly, the Uzbek grammatical tradition, independently of the cognitive paradigm, has accumulated descriptions that prove directly relevant to our task. A. Khojiev's classical study of auxiliary (analytical) verbs in the Uzbek language describes the very system which, upon cognitive reinterpretation, emerges as an analytical mechanism for the conceptualization of the aspectual structure of an event (Khojiev, 1966).

It should be clarified that there is a need to evaluate the current state of contrastive Russian-Uzbek studies. Two genres predominantly prevail here: translation studies, which record the difficulties of transferring culture-bound vocabulary and grammatical categories, and methodological studies, oriented toward teaching Russian to native Uzbek speakers.

Methodologically, the proposed approach inherits the traditions of contrastive linguistics while substantially reinterpreting them. Classical contrastive analysis of the mid-20th century (R. Lado, U. Weinreich) compared the systems of two languages element by element, focusing primarily on predicting interference during second-language acquisition (Lado, 1957).

The concept of equivalence, central to translation theory and comparative studies, ceases under a cognitive approach to be interpreted as a correspondence of forms or even denotations, and is instead construed as a correspondence of construal methods. E. Nida's dynamic equivalence (Nida, 1964) and the translation shifts described by J.-P. Vinay and J. Darbelnet (Vinay & Darbelnet, 1995) acquire

© 2026 Arabian International Conference on Science,Technology and Innovation. All rights reserved.

cognitive justification because a translator, faced with a mismatch of categorical grids or mandatory grammatical parameters, is forced not to pick an equivalent, but rather to reconstruct the conceptualization and re-construe it using the means of the target language. It is precisely for this reason that systematic translational correspondences serve in this study as a privileged empirical material: at points where translation fails, the mismatch of conceptualizations is laid bare, which constitutes the very subject of cognitive-contrastive analysis.

It is necessary to outline the specific areal profile of the Uzbek language. Unlike the majority of Turkish languages, standard literary Uzbek, under centuries of Persian-Tajik environmental influence, lost consistent vowel harmony and borrowed a number of syntactic models, including the izafet construction (Weinreich, 1953). This makes Uzbek a particularly convenient object of comparison, as its Turkic agglutinative base has overlaid an Iranian-derived cultural-conceptual layer, causing many core concepts of the “inner human” and social ethics to bear a dual, Turkic-Iranian genealogy.

Finally, we must outline the gap in the study of the proper Turkic worldview. Although individual concepts of Uzbek culture—hospitality, honor, respect for elders—have repeatedly been described in ethnolinguistic and linguocultural terms, a systematic reconstruction of the Uzbek linguistic worldview as a cohesive system rather than a set of isolated "cultural words" remains largely a task for the future.

Furthermore, usage-oriented and corpus methods make it possible to test hypotheses about conceptualization not on isolated examples chosen by the researcher, but on reproducible distributions across corpora. For Russian-Uzbek comparison, this opens up the prospect of verifying the qualitative generalizations put forward here: the frequency of auxiliary verbs, the distribution of evidential and non-evidential forms, and the collocatability of culturally loaded concepts. Russian and Uzbek provide the speaker with non-matching sets of such means, thereby forcing them to construe text differently even under conditions of identical reference.

The most illustrative contrast lies in the domain of verbal aspect. The Russian language grammaticalizes the opposition of perfective and imperfective aspect as mandatory: every verb is forced to be assigned to one member of the opposition, and the rich prefixal system (читать — прочитать — дочитать — перечитать — зачитаться—to read, to read through, to finish reading, to reread, to read to the point of intoxication) encodes not only completion but also subtle nuances of the mode of action (Zalizniak & Shmelev, 2000). A native speaker of Russian cannot conceptualize an event without deciding on its limit and wholeness; aspect is, in terms of cognitive grammar, a mandatory parameter of construal. The Uzbek language is structured differently: aspectual-actional meanings are expressed here predominantly analytically—through a combination of the converbal (participial) form of a lexical verb with an auxiliary verb, each of which has its own assigned actional semantics (Khojiev, 1966).

Thus, the construction o‘qib chiqmoq (lit. "having read to go out") conveys reading to the end, a "thorough" mastery of a text; yozib qo‘ymoq (lit. "having written to put")—an action performed in advance, "for future use"; yig‘lab yubormoq (lit. "having cried to let go")—a sudden, uncontrolled onset ("to burst into tears"); uxlab qolmoq (lit. "having slept to remain")—unintentional sliding into a state ("to fall asleep, to doze off"). The cognitive difference is substantial: where Russian packs actional information inside a single word-form via a prefix, Uzbek unfolds it into a syntagm, with the auxiliary verb retaining a transparent figurative motivation ("to go out," "to put," "to let go," "to remain"). Russian event construal is morphologically compressed and largely opaque to the average speaker; Uzbek construal is analytical and metaphorically "readable." This difference in packaging has a direct translational consequence: the Russian prefix and the Uzbek auxiliary verb do not stand in a relation of one-to-one correspondence, and selecting an equivalent requires reconstructing the actional profile rather than searching for a lexical "partner."

The second significant contrast concerns the grammaticalization of the source of knowledge. In the Russian language, the indication of whether the speaker observed an event firsthand or learned of it from others is lexicalized and optional (говорят, якобы, оказывается, по слухам — they say, supposedly, it

© 2026 Arabian International Conference on Science,Technology and Innovation. All rights reserved.

turns out, by rumor). In Uzbek, however, the opposition between witnessed and unwitnessed information is built into the verbal paradigm: the form in -di marks past tense known to the speaker directly, whereas the form in -ibdi and the copula ekan signal mediated knowledge obtained through report or inferred from consequences, frequently with an shade of surprise (mirativity) (Aikhenvald, 2004). The sentence U kelibdi communicates not merely "he came," but "he, as it turns out/as it transpired, came"; Kasal ekan—"he, as is revealed, is sick."

The third contrast relates to the conceptualization of space. Russian expresses spatial relations using prepositions combined with cases (в столе, на столе, под столом—in the table, on the table, under the table) and, importantly, encodes the trajectory of movement via verbal prefixes, leaving the root of the verb to express the manner of motion (в-бежать, вы-бежать, при-бежать, у-бежать—to run in, to run out, to run up, to run away). In L. Talmy's typology, this makes Russian a satellite-framed language: the path is encoded by a "satellite" (prefix), and the manner by the root (Talmy, 2000). Uzbek is structured fundamentally differently. First, spatial relations are expressed by postpositions and spatial cases (the locative-temporal in -da, ablative in -dan, directive in -ga), with fine-grained localization achieved through relational nouns—etymologically nouns denoting parts of an object: stol ustida (lit. "of the table on-its-upper part" = "on the table"), stol ostida ("under the table"), quti ichida ("inside the box"), uy yonida ("near the house").

The cognitive difference is twofold. On the one hand, Uzbek localization is bodily and objectively motivated: "inside," "upper part," "lower part," "side" are metonymically unfolded parts of an object, whereas Russian prepositions are largely desemanticized. The spatial system of Uzbek is thus closer to the surface of image-schematic experience—to those pre-linguistic gestalts of "container" and "path" discussed in cognitive semantics. On the other hand, in encoding movement, Uzbek tends toward the verb-converb method: trajectory is expressed not by a prefix, but by a chain of converb + directional verb—kirib ketmoq ("having entered to go away"), chiqib kelmoq ("having exited to come") (Slobin, 1996). The Russian verb влететь (to fly in) packages manner and path into a single word-form; the Uzbek equivalent distributes them across the elements of the construction. For the speaker, this implies a different allocation of attention: Russian profiles manner in the root and path in the satellite simultaneously, while Uzbek linearly unfolds the phases of displacement.

Finally, two systemic absences in Uzbek restructure the construal of reference. Uzbek lacks grammatical gender: the pronoun u covers "he," "she," and "it," and agreement in gender is entirely absent. The Russian mandatory gender classification, by contrast, imposes a categorization of the world based on a feature that is not grammaticalized in Uzbek conceptualization, rendering Russian gender a typically "empty" parameter for the Uzbek mindset. Number is no less revealing: following a numeral, an Uzbek noun remains in the singular (common) form—uch kitob ("three book"), besh ta olma ("five ta apple"), where ta is a numerative (classifier) particle (Corbett, 2000). The plural in -lar expresses not so much quantity as collectivity, distributivity, or politeness. Russian grammar compels mandatory quantification and number agreement; Uzbek treats plurality as an optional, pragmatically loaded choice. Underlying this is a difference in the conceptualization of individuation: where Russian defaults to enumerating and delimiting, Uzbek defaults to leaving the volume of reference unspecified, leaving it to context.

The conceptualization of causation deserves special consideration, since it is here that the typological contrast between Russian and Uzbek manifests with the greatest systematicity. According to L.Talmy's force dynamics theory, languages grammatically encode the configuration of forces—the interaction of an "agonist" and an "antagonist," the exertion and overcoming of resistance—and causative constructions are a special case of such encoding. The Russian language expresses causation predominantly lexically and analytically: via separate verbs (учить [teach] "to make someone know," кормить [feed] "to give to eat," смешить [make laugh] "to force to laugh"), prefixal derivatives, and

© 2026 Arabian International Conference on Science,Technology and Innovation. All rights reserved.

periphrases with заставить, велеть, дать (to force, to order, to let). Causal connection in Russian lacks a single regular morphological expression; it is scattered across the lexicon.

The Uzbek language, by contrast, possesses a highly productive morphological causative—regular affixes -tir-, -dir-, -t-, -ir-, -giz-, -kaz-, which attach to the verb stem and systematically increase its valence (Comrie, 1989; Shibatani, 1976). Thus, kul- ("to laugh") kuldir- ("to make laugh"); ye- ("to eat") yedir- ("to feed"); kiy- ("to put on oneself") kiydir- ("to dress someone"); o‘qi- ("to read") o‘qit- ("to teach, to make read"). The cognitive difference is fundamental: where Russian is forced to store a causative pair as two separate, lexically unrelated signs, Uzbek constructs it as a regular derivation—the application of a causative operator to a basic event schema. Causation in Uzbek is thus a compositional, transparent operation upon the structure of an event, whereas in Russian it is predominantly lexicalized and rendered opaque.

Moreover, the Uzbek morphological causative permits recursion: affixes can stack, generating a double causative—o‘qi-t-tir- ("to make someone force another to read"), yoz-dir- ("to have someone write") with the potential for further extension of the causative chain. Russian lacks a regular means for such "tiering" of causation and is forced to resort to cumbersome analytical periphrasis (to make someone order someone to write). Behind this formal asymmetry lies a difference in the conceptualization of cause-and-effect structure: Uzbek treats a causal chain as a morphologically integrated whole, profiling it as a single complex event; Russian unfolds the same chain into a syntactic sequence of separate events. For translational practice, this means that the Uzbek causative and its double forms lack a Russian morphological correlate and require structural reorganization during transfer a typical case where a mismatch in mandatory grammatical mechanisms (the level of construal) compels the translator to use explication.

The causative belongs to a broader system of voice affixes in the Uzbek verb, which includes the passive (-il-, -in-: yoz- "to write" yozil- "to be written"), reflexive (-in-: yuv- "to wash" yuvin- "to wash oneself"), and reciprocal-collaborative (-ish-: yoz- yozish- "to correspond with one another"). All these operations are regular and morphological, whereas Russian expresses corresponding meanings either through the reflexive -ся, via separate lexemes, or analytically. The systematicity of Uzbek voice derivation implies that the speaker conceptualizes diathesis transformations of an event as regular operations upon a single base; Russian treats them less uniformly. Thus, in the domain of voice as well, a general regularity is confirmed: Uzbek tends toward morphological compositionality where Russian relies on lexical suppletion and analytism.

The cognitive interpretation does not consist in claiming that one language is "richer" than another, but rather that the prototype and internal structure of the kinship category differ between the two languages. For the Uzbek system, the line of descent (paternal/maternal) and relative age are mandatory axes of categorization, reflecting the social significance of these parameters within the culture; for Russian, they are optional and supplemented lexically when necessary (старший брат [older brother], дядя по матери [maternal uncle]). The categorical grid of kinship is, therefore, a projection of a culturally entrenched model of the family rather than a neutral mapping of biological relations. The translational consequence is obvious: the Uzbek aka lacks a Russian single-word equivalent without a loss of either age or categorical information, and the choice of rendition is each time a decision regarding which facet of the prototype to preserve.

The color domain is a classic testing ground for the Neo-Whorfian program. Turkic languages historically exhibit the macro-color ko‘k, covering the blue-green region of the spectrum, traces of which are preserved in modern Uzbek: ko‘k choy—"green tea" (lit. "blue tea"), ko‘kat / ko‘kalamzor—"greens, green plantings," even though standard Uzbek has also entrenched a separate yashil ("green") (Berlin & Kay, 1969). The Russian system, with its early specialization of "blue" (синий) and "green" (зеленый), as well as the typologically rare separation of "dark blue" (синий) and "light blue / sky blue" (голубой) into two basic terms, draws a boundary within a region that the Uzbek color grid historically treated as

© 2026 Arabian International Conference on Science,Technology and Innovation. All rights reserved.

uniform. Here it is important to avoid a "strong" relativistic overinterpretation: what is at issue is not an inability of native Uzbek speakers to distinguish shades, but the fact that the boundary of the basic category has been drawn by the language in a different place and that the prototypical center of the term ko‘k is shifted relative to the Russian синий. It is precisely this shift in prototype and boundary, rather than a difference in perceptual capabilities, that constitutes the cognitively significant fact.

The numerative particle ta and general number, already mentioned, receive additional clarification at the categorical level. The presence of classifier quantification brings Uzbek closer to languages where enumeration presupposes the choice of a "measure," pointing to a different conceptualization of the transition from mass to discrete units. Russian, with its mandatory morphological marking of number and agreement, by default individuates an object; Uzbek leaves it categorically "unmarked" until pragmatics demands otherwise. This is not a technical detail of morphology, but a difference in where the language draws the boundary between countable and uncountable, between singular and collective.

Russian naive anthropology, reconstructed in Russian semantics, distributes human inner life among душа (soul), сердце (heart), ум (mind), and дух (spirit), with душа occupying a central, culturally loaded place in this system (Apresyan, 1995). The Uzbek worldview operates with a different, only partially overlapping set: jon (life, vital principle, "soul" in the sense of the breath of life), ko‘ngil (heart-as-disposition, the locus of feelings and intentions), dil (heart in a poetic, Persian-derived register), yurak (the heart as an organ and seat of courage), aql (reason). Significantly, the division of the inner human is carried out along different lines: where Russian concentrates emotional-moral weight in душа, Uzbek distributes it between ko‘ngil and dil, while allocating the vital component to jon. Comparison at the worldview level thus confirms the conclusion of the categorical level: the mismatch here is systemic and motivated, rather than reducing to a list of lexical gaps.

Cultural specificity is even more clearly manifested in concepts regulating social behavior. The Uzbek uyat ("shame, modesty, the impermissible") is a core regulatory concept that sets the boundary of the permissible through the prism of collective evaluation; close to it are or and nomus ("honor, dignity") and andisha ("tact, delicate restraint, scrupulousness"), forming a dense network for which the Russian words стыд (shame), честь (honor), совесть (conscience), and деликатность (tact/delicacy) provide only approximate projections. The concept mehmondo‘stlik ("hospitality"), resting on the high value status of mehmon ("guest"), and the concept qadr ("dignity, respectful evaluation of a person") encode a model of social relations in which the honor of the lineage, hospitality, and respect for elders form a coherent axiological system (Kövecses, 2005).

These concepts are not "untranslatable" in a mystical sense, but their adequate transfer requires the reconstruction of an idealized cognitive model rather than the selection of a dictionary equivalent. Russian стыдно (ashamed) and Uzbek uyat point to intersecting but non-matching scenarios: the Russian concept is more internalized (shame as an inner experience), while the Uzbek concept is more socialized (uyat as a violation of a collectively sanctioned norm, evaluated from the outside). Here cultural linguistics, which treats meaning as distributed across the cultural-cognitive schemas of a community, provides a precise apparatus: a concept is described not as a feature of individual consciousness, but as a shared schema to which the speaker gains access through language (Sharifian, 2017).

The worldview is most densely entrenched in phraseology, since it is precisely fixed expressions that preserve the figurative foundations of conceptualization. Uzbek idioms with the components ko‘ngil and yurak (ko‘ngli bo‘sh—"soft-hearted," lit. "his heart is empty"; yuragi tosh—"hard-hearted," lit. "his heart is stone") realize conceptual metaphors, some of which are universal (the heart as the seat of feelings), while others are culturally specific in their choice of source domain and evaluative vector (Kövecses, 2005). The comparison of Russian and Uzbek phraseology makes it possible to empirically separate the universal and variable layers of metaphor: where the source domain coincides but evaluation

© 2026 Arabian International Conference on Science,Technology and Innovation. All rights reserved.

or collocability diverges, we discover a cultural "tuning" of the universal mechanism; where the source domain itself diverges, we find a difference in the very foundation of conceptualization.

To summarize, let us emphasize the translational significance of the analysis performed. Each of the examined contrasts—obligatory aspect versus analytical actionalism, lexicalized causation versus morphological causative, desemanticized prepositions versus objectively motivated relational nouns, age-linear kinship grid versus neutral grid—represents a point where translation cannot be limited to substituting an equivalent and requires the reconstruction of conceptualization followed by its re-construal using the means of the target language. It is precisely for this reason that the proposed methodology possesses not only descriptive but also practical value: it transforms the translator's intuitively felt "resistance of the material" into an explicable procedure, indicating at which of the three levels—construal, categorization, or worldview—a given difficulty is rooted and what kind of transformation is necessary to overcome it.

References:

1. Aikhenvald, A. Y. (2004). Evidentiality. Oxford University Press.
2. Apresyan, Yu. D. (1995). Leksicheskaya semantika: Sinomicheskie sredstva yazyka [Lexical Semantics: Synonymic Means of Language]. Nauka.
3. Berlin, B., & Kay, P. (1969). Basic Color Terms: Their Universality and Evolution. University of California Press.
4. Comrie, B. (1989). Language Universals and Linguistic Typology: Syntax and Morphology. University of Chicago Press.
5. Corbett, G. G. (2000). Number. Cambridge University Press.
6. Khojiev, A. (1966). O‘zbek tili ko‘makchi fe’llari [Auxiliary Verbs of the Uzbek Language]. Fan.
7. Kövecses, Z. (2005). Metaphor in Culture: Universality and Variation. Cambridge University Press.
8. Lado, R. (1957). Linguistics Across Cultures: Applied Linguistics for Language Teachers. University of Michigan Press.
9. Mahmudov, N., & Khudoyberganova, D. (2015). O‘zbek tili o‘xshatishlarining lingvokulturologik lug‘ati [Linguocultural Dictionary of Uzbek Similes]. Universitet.
10. Nida, E. A. (1964). Toward a Science of Translating. E.J. Brill.
11. Rahmatullaev, Sh. (1992). O‘zbek tilining izohli fraseologik lug‘ati [Explanatory Phraseological Dictionary of the Uzbek Language]. O‘qituvchi.
12. Safarov, Sh. (2006). Kognitiv tilshunoslik [Cognitive Linguistics]. Voris-Nashriyot.
13. Sharifian, F. (2017). Cultural Conceptualizations and Language. Routledge.
14. Shibatani, M. (Ed.). (1976). Syntax and Semantics, Vol. 6: The Grammar of Causative Constructions. Academic Press.
15. Slobin, D. I. (1996). Two ways to travel: Verbs of motion in English and Spanish. In M. Shibatani & S. A. Thompson (Eds.), Essays in Semantics (pp. 195–219). Oxford University Press.
16. Talmy, L. (2000). Toward a Cognitive Semantics (Vols. 1–2). MIT Press.
17. Vinay, J.-P., & Darbelnet, J. (1995). Comparative Stylistics of French and English: A Methodology for Translation (J. C. Sager & M.-J. Hamel, Trans.). John Benjamins.
18. Weinreich, U. (1953). Languages in Contact: Findings and Problems. Linguistic Circle of New York.
19. Zalizniak, Anna A., & Shmelev, A. D. (2000). Vvedenie v russkuyu aleseologiyu. Yazyki russkoy kultury.